

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

July 17, 1997

Scientific Officer Code: 333 Gary M. Koob Office of Naval Research Ballston Tower One 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217-5660

Re: N00014-94-1-0661

Dear Dr. Koob:

Enclosed please find the annual technical report for the above-referenced grant. The report has been distributed as listed below. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (301) 405-2729.

Sincerely, andrea V. Busada

Andrea V. Busada Research Coordinator

High Performance Systems Software Laboratory

Administrative Grants Officer Office of Naval Research Resident Representative 101 Marietta Street, Suite 2805 Atlanta, Georgia 30323-0008 1 copy

Director, Naval Research Laboratory Attn.: Code 2627 Washington, DC 20375 1 copy

Defense Technical Information Center Building 5, Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22304-6145 2 copies

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

GRANT NUMBER: N00014-94-1-0661

FORM A2-2 AUGMENTATION AWARDS FOR SCIENCE & ENGINEERING RESEARCH TRAINING (AASERT) REPORTING FORM

The Department of Defense (DOD) requires certain information to evaluate the effectiveness of the AASERT program. By accepting this Grant Modification, which bestows the AASERT funds, the Grantee agrees to provide the information requested below to the Government's technical point of contact by each annual anniversary of the AASERT award date.

2. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of full-time equivalent graduate students (FTEGS) supported by the Parent Agreement during the 12-month period prior to the AASERT award date. a. Funding: g. 66,854.40 b. Number FTEGS: 1 3. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of FTEGS supported by the Parent Agreement during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g. 0 b. Number FTEGS: 0 4. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g. 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: C. Number UGS: 0 FTELFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the AASERT award are U.S. citizens.	1. Gran	tee identificat	ion data: (R E T	and Grant numbers found on Page 1 of Grant
University Name b. NO0014-94-1-0661 Grant Number d. Joel H. Saltz P.I. Name e. Prom: 01 Jul To: 30 Jun AASERT Reporting Period EMI: Grant to thick AMEN over to stracked to referred to becoming and the number of full-time equivalent graduate students (FTEGS) supported by the Parent Agreement during the 12-month period prior to the AASERT award date. a. Funding: g 66,854.40 b. Number FTEGS: 1 3. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of FTEGS supported by the Parent Agreement during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g 0 b. Number FTEGS: 0 4. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: 2 C. Number UGS: 0 FERIFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the MASERT award are U.S. citizens.	a	University of Ma	arvland		
Grant Number d. Joel H. Saltz P.I. Name e. Prom: 01 Jul To: 30 Jun AASERT Reporting Period EDII: Grant to thick AMENY seed to strated is referred to beneafor as Taxon Agreement. 2. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of full-time equivalent graduate students (FTEGS) supported by the Parent Agreement during the 12-month period prior to the AASERT award date. a. Funding: b. Number FTEGS: 1. 3. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of FTEGS supported by the Parent Agreement during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: b. Number FTEGS: 4. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: 3. 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: C. Number UGS: 0 FTERFFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the MASERT award are U.S. citizens.				·····	
Grant Number d. Joel H. Saltz P.I. Name e. Prom: 01 Jul To: 30 Jun AASERT Reporting Period EMM: 6reet to which AMEMI work to establish to referred to become to Terror Agreement. 2. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of full-time equivalent graduate students (FTEGS) supported by the Parent Agreement during the 12-month period prior to the AASERT award date. a. Funding: g. 66,854.40 b. Number FTEGS: 1 3. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of FTEGS supported by the Parent Agreement during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g. 0 b. Number FTEGS: 0 4. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g. 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: 2 c. Number UGS: 0 FELFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the MASERT award are U.S. citizens.	L	N00014-94-1-0661		c.	333n01201
d. Joel H. Saltz P.I. Name e. Prom: 01 Jul To: 30 Jun AASERT Reporting Period EDIT: Creat to which AMERI serie is strained is referred to hereafter as Transfer Reporting Period 2. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of full-time equivalent graduate students (FTEGS) supported by the Parent Agreement during the 12-month period prior to the AASERT award date. a. Funding: b. Number FTEGS: J. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of FTEGS supported by the Parent Agreement during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: b. Number FTEGS: J. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: 3. 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: C. Number UGS: J. July 97	.	Grant Number			
P.I. Name AASERT Reporting Period Diff. Count to thick AMERY served to streated to referred to benefits as Toront Agreement. 2. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of full-time equivalent graduate students (FTEGS) supported by the Parent Agreement during the 12-month period prior to the AASERT award date. a. Funding: g 66,854.40 b. Number FTEGS: 1 3. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of FTEGS supported by the Parent Agreement during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g 0 b. Number FTEGS: 0 4. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: C. Number UGS: 0 FRIFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the AASERT award are U.S. citizens.	•	Tool W. Colon			
2. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of full-time equivalent graduate students (FTEGS) supported by the Parent Agreement during the 12-month period prior to the AASERT award date. a. Funding: g 66,854.40 b. Number FTEGS: 1 3. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of FTEGS supported by the Parent Agreement during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g 0 b. Number FTEGS: 0 4. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: C. Number UGS: 0 PERIFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the AASERT award are U.S. citizens.	đ.			•.	From: U1 Jul To: 30 Jun
2. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of full-time equivalent graduate students (FTEGS) supported by the Parent Agreement during the 12-month period prior to the AASERT award date. a. Funding: g. 66,854.40 b. Number FTEGS: 1 3. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of FTEGS supported by the Parent Agreement during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g. 0 b. Number FTEGS: 0 4. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g. 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: C. Number UGS: 0 FTELFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the AASERT award are U.S. citizens.		1.1			mmus wakas arud s as son
2. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of full-time equivalent graduate students (FTEGS) supported by the Parent Agreement during the 12-month period prior to the AASERT award date. a. Funding: g 66,854.40 b. Number FTEGS: 1 3. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of FTEGS supported by the Parent Agreement during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g 0 b. Number FTEGS: 0 4. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: g 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: C. Number UGS: 0 FERIFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the MASERT award are U.S. citizens.	EXX: Great t	a shish AARRI amed in	strobal is suferrul	se here	ofter as "Parent Arresport."
b. Number FTEGS: 1 3. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of FTEGS supported by the Parent Agreement during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: \$ 0 b. Number FTEGS: 0 4. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: \$ 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: 2 c. Number UGS: 0 FERIFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the MASERT award are U.S. citizens.	equivaler	nt graduate stu	dents (FTEGS)	sup	ported by the Parent Agreement during
Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of FTEGS supported by the Parent Agreement during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: 5 0 b. Number FTEGS: 0 i. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: 5 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: C. Number UGS: 0 Increby verify that all students supported by the AASERT award are U.S. citizens.	a.	Funding:	s 66,854.40		ettimuseididuse
3. Total funding of the Parent Agreement and the number of FTEGS supported by the Parent Agreement during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: 5 0 b. Number FTEGS: 0 4. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: 3 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: C. Number UGS: 0 FERIFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the MASERT award are U.S. citizens.	h.	Number FTECS:	1		
a. Funding: b. Number FTEGS: 0 4. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: 5 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: C. Number UGS: 0 FERFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the MASERT award are U.S. citizens.	۵.	Hammer tries.			
b. Number FTEGS: 4. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: 5. 38,322 b. Number FTEGS: C. Number UGS: 0 VERIFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the MASERT award are U.S. citizens. 17 July 97	by the Pa	arent Agreement	during the	curre	ent 12-month reporting period.
4. Total AASERT funding and the number of FTEGS and undergraduate students (UGS) supported by AASERT funds during the current 12-month reporting period. a. Funding: b. Number FTEGS: c. Number UGS: 0 FERFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the NASERT award are U.S. citizens. 17 July 97		-	0		
a. Funding: a. Funding: b. Number FTEGS: c. Number UGS: 17 July 97	b.	Number FTEGS:	U		
b. Number FTEGS: 2 c. Number UGS: 0 FRIFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the MASERT award are U.S. citizens. 17 July 97	4. Total (UGS) sup	AASERT fundin	er funds duri	mber ng th	of FTEGS and undergraduate students e current 12-month reporting period.
C. Number UGS: ORRIFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the WASERT award are U.S. citizens. 17 July 97	a.	Funding:	3 8,322	···	
TERIFICATION STATEMENT: I hereby verify that all students supported by the WASERT award are U.S. citizens. 17 July 97	b.	Number FTEGS:	2		
ASERT award are U.S. citizens.	c.	Number UGS:	0		
Tal July 97	Verivicat Masert aw	TION STATEMENT:	I hereby veitizens.	rify	that all students supported by the
rincipal investigator Date	Jal				·
	rincipal	Investigator			Date

وهر وه ما د و د کاره در های میراد د در دربو و را در دو برساد در اوسا	OCUMENTATION I		OMB No 0704 0108
She to a classification of the selection of 222%	the regions in the the first are region to	ger frinde in in der eigt. Die geren fige for 75 in Grings (1) Best Friederichte gebor 16 in 28 in der in Geren geboren Grinde in der Fri 17 in der 171 Bestehne und Reite Grinde in Bestehn	am Arm gertstraet by a sameratumig die ether plasse bou derig the Burde in motion at night angle their lides in be on the gal of Open into the angle angle in lides between his 1994-0488, Albahings in the lides and a
. AGENCY USE ONLY (I cave Blan	A) 2. REPORT DATE O1 Jul 97	13. REPORT TYPE AME	
TITLE AND SUBTITLE			5 PUNIONG NUMBERS
calable I/O for Irre	egular Loosely Syn	chronous · .	G N00014-94-1-0661
AUTHOR(S)			
nurag Acharya, compi	ller		
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NA			B. PERI ORANING ORGANIZATION
niversity of Marylan	ıd	l	REPORT NUMBER
epartment of Compute	r Science	1	
ollege Park, Marylan	d 20742-3255		
SPONSORING / MONITORING AGE		(5)	10 SPONSORING MONITORING
Office of Naval Res	earch, ONR 252 DG	f	
Ballston Tower One		Į	
800 North Quincy St Arlington, VA 2221		.[·
I. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	/-JUUV		
a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY S	TATEMENT		DE DISTRIBUTION CODE
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	I	
		}	
		1	
·			
AAPTRAPT 144			
I. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)			
To achieve good I/ it is necessary to level. The first	o work both at the section describes lel sparse cholesky as application and	application and our effor at development of the second section.	the system support reloping an efficient cample of an irregular
To achieve good I/ it is necessary to level. The first out-of-core parall loosely synchronou Jovian parallel I/	o work both at the section describes lel sparse cholesky as application and	application and our effor at development of the second section.	veloping an efficient cample of an irregula:
To achieve good I/ it is necessary to level. The first out-of-core parall loosely synchronou Jovian parallel I/	o work both at the section describes lel sparse cholesky as application and	application and our effor at development of the second section.	the system support reloping an efficient cample of an irregular
To achieve good I/ it is necessary to level. The first out-of-core parall loosely synchronou Jovian parallel I/	o work both at the section describes lel sparse cholesky as application and	application and our effor at development of the second section.	the system support reloping an efficient cample of an irregular
To achieve good I/ it is necessary to level. The first out-of-core parall loosely synchronou Jovian parallel I/ operations.	section describes section describes el sparse cholesky as application and O library which pr	application and our effor at development of solver as an extinct of the second section of the second support o	the system support reloping an efficient sample of an irregulation describes the for collective I/O

:

.

100

Report on Scalable I/O for Irregular Loosely Synchronous Problems

Joel Saltz, Anurag Acharya
Department of Computer Science
University of Maryland, College Park MD 20742

July 1997

In the first part of this project, we focused on performance of individual applications. We developed an out-of-core parallel sparse cholesky solver which achieved a maximum application-level I/O rate of 430 MB/s on our 16-processor IBM SP-2. This year, we have broadened our focus to cover a wider variety of applications. Our goal was to determine the requirements and techniques for a large class of applications.

To this end, we have analyzed a diverse suite of I/O-intensive parallel applications to determine their I/O requirements and the implications of these requirements for the design of I/O systems for parallel machines. We attempted to answer the following questions. First, what are the steadystate and peak I/O rates required by the application? These rates indicate how aggressive the I/O system needs to be. Second, what spatial patterns, if any, exist in the sequence of I/O requests? In particular, what are the common request sizes and whether I/O requests are sequential. Third, what is the degree of intra-processor and inter-processor locality in I/O accesses? These measures indicate whether caching previously accessed data is likely to improve performance and if so, where should the cache(s) be placed and what caching policies should be used. This information is also useful to understand the impact of alternative disk placements on application performance. For example, if all processors in an application access only their own partition of the data, the use of private disks instead of shared disks can reduce communication requirements and can increase aggregate I/O bandwidth. On the other hand, if the data in a partition is written by the owning processor but read by all processors, there may be no significant performance penalty to using shared disks. Fourth, does the application structure allow programmers to disclose future I/O requests to the I/O system? If this is indeed the case, it would provide an opportunity for the I/O system to improve the utilization of the storage devices as well as reduce the latency of I/O requests [?, ?]. Finally, what patterns, if any, exist in the sequence of inter-arrival times for I/O requests? This information would allow the I/O system to estimate when I/O requests that have been previously disclosed will actually be made. This can allow it to better schedule prefetches for the sequence of I/O requests disclosed by individual applications as well as those disclosed by a group of applications.

To address these questions, we have analyzed I/O request traces for a diverse set of I/O-intensive parallel applications. This set includes four non-scientific applications (IBM's DB2 Parallel Edition, datamining, a parallel web server and parallel textual search) and three parallel scientific applications. These applications have been tuned, to various degrees, to achieve good I/O performance. We believe that this is important as studying applications which have not been tuned for I/O performance can lead to misleading conclusions [?]. We ran these applications on an IBM SP-2 and captured the I/O requests using the trace facility provided by AIX 4.1. In addition, we have acquired the I/O request traces made available by the Pablo group at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign [?]. These traces correspond to four parallel scientific applications from several domains.

Some of our conclusions were:

- Given the high steady-state and peak demands for read requests, I/O systems should be aggressive on optimizing data retrieval; we expect that simple write-behind policies would be effective given the low demand for writing data.
- For the current hardware, an I/O system that delivers a read bandwidth of about 19 MB/s per-processor should meet the requirements of even the most demanding applications and that a read bandwidth of 10 MB/s per-processor should be adequate for most applications.
- For the variety of applications examined in this study, request were usually large and the access patterns were both simpler and more complex than nested strides.
- There is little or no write-sharing between processors.
- Local disks are an important component of I/O systems for parallel machines.
- Different application require different caching policies in particular, they need different cache
 replacement policies and different cache placement (server/client/both) decisions. Ideally, I/O
 systems for parallel machines should allow the application to control or specify the caching
 policy.
- For many applications, the sequence of inter-arrival times between read requests can be described by relatively simple patterns. We have seen three patterns: constant, piece-wise constant and piece-wise quadratic. The repetitive nature of the patterns suggests that it might be possible for the I/O system to determine the pattern during the first few repetitions and to use that information to estimate the inter-arrival times for the subsequent repetitions. We are planning to explore this further.